

INTIMACY, SPOUSE PERCEPTION, AND MARITAL SATISFACTION

By

ANITA L. SALAMON

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1993

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Hugh C. Davis, my committee chairman, for his encouragement and support both in my clinical training and in completion of this study. He has been most important to me as a mentor throughout graduate school. I have the greatest affection for and gratitude to him. Truly, without his guidance I may never have completed graduate school. I wish to thank Dr. Russell Bauer and Dr. Michael Geisser for taking time, regardless of their busy schedules, give assistance and direction regarding methodology and statistics. I wish to express appreciation to Dr. Robert Ziller for his support both as a member of this committee and as an instructor. His enthusiasm for scholarship is contagious. I wish to thank Dr. Simon Johnson for his kind willingness to participate as a member of my committee.

I would like to thank Martha Breen, without whom I could not have collected data in two places at once. She has generously given assistance in many ways throughout this study. My family and friends have provided immeasurable support; I offer warm-hearted thanks to them. I offer special thanks to Carol and Adam Bishop, Andrea Alentado, Laura Cobb, Melodye Gaskin, and Ben Stevens for providing

concrete assistance that made completion of this study possible. Thanks go to my beloved friend and colleague, Thrower Starr (soon to be Dr. Starr) with whom I have learned more than I ever thought possible.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .  | ii          |
| ABSTRACT . . . . .  | vi          |
| CHAPTERS  |             |
| 1 INTRODUCTION . . . . .  | 1           |
| Interpersonal Perception . . . . .  | 3           |
| Intimacy . . . . .  | 11          |
| Interpersonal Assessment . . . . .  | 15          |
| Methodological Issues. . . . .  | 22          |
| Hypotheses . . . . .  | 23          |
| 2 METHOD . . . . .  | 25          |
| Subjects . . . . .  | 25          |
| Instruments . . . . .   | 26          |
| Procedure . . . . .   | 30          |
| Analyses . . . . .  | 31          |
| 3 RESULTS. . . . .  | 34          |
| 4 DISCUSSION . . . . .  | 43          |
| Introduction . . . . .  | 43          |
| Correlations between Interpersonal Perception<br>Variables and Intimacy Factors . . . . .                                 | 44          |
| Relationship between Discrepancy in<br>Interpersonal Perception and Marital<br>Intimacy and Marital Satisfaction. . . . . | 47          |
| Relationship between Spousal Similarity<br>and Marital Satisfaction . . . . .   | 52          |
| Conclusion . . . . .  | 53          |
| 5 SUMMARY. . . . .  | 56          |

## APPENDICES

|   |  |    |
|---|--|----|
| A | EXAMPLES OF ITEMS FROM BENJAMIN'S SASB . . . .                                     | 58 |
| B | SUBSCALE OF SPOUSE OBSERVATION CHECKLIST . . .                                     | 60 |
| C | TABLES OF MEANS AND CORRELATIONS OF SCORES<br>FOR INTERPERSONAL VARIABLES. . . . . | 62 |
|   | REFERENCES . . . . .   | 64 |
|   | BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH. . . . .   | 69 |

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of  
the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

INTIMACY, SPOUSE PERCEPTION AND MARITAL SATISFACTION

By

Anita L. Salamon

May 1993

Chairman: Hugh C. Davis

Major Department: Clinical and Health Psychology

Interpersonal perception in relationships has been widely studied in a variety of Social Science fields. The research literature on marital satisfaction suggests that incongruent, distorted perceptions of one's spouse or of one's marital relationship distinguishes a maritally satisfied couple from a dissatisfied one. Although researchers have utilized a variety of methods to attempt to explore and understand this phenomenon, the multiplicity of instruments used has served to confound rather than to clarify the issue. Empirically developed interpersonal assessment instruments, such as Benjamin's Structural Analysis of Social Behavior, have recently contributed a methodologically sound approach with which to explore spouses' interpersonal perceptions within the marital relationship. Recent research has also more clearly defined

components of marital intimacy and its relationship to marital satisfaction.

The present study explored discrepancies in spouses' interpersonal perception, utilizing the Structural Analysis of Social Behavior, and explored the relationship of those discrepancies to marital intimacy and to marital satisfaction. Results indicated that there was a significant inverse relationship between discrepancy in interpersonal perception and both marital intimacy and marital satisfaction. The greater the discrepancy, the lower the marital intimacy or the lower the marital satisfaction; the less the discrepancy, the greater the marital intimacy or the greater the marital satisfaction. Specific areas of discrepancy of interpersonal perception, such as affectionate behaviors or controlling behaviors, were identified. Additionally, component factors of marital intimacy which correlated significantly with interpersonal perception discrepancy variables were identified. Conclusions suggest that using such specifically designed interpersonal assessment instruments to measure relationship phenomena could contribute important information to the field of interpersonal perception and marital relationships.

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

There has been interest in studying marital relationships and marital satisfaction for years. The earliest scientific investigation took place in the early 1920s, and the results indicated that there were gender differences in variables which predicted marital satisfaction (Hamilton, 1948). The first published study in marital research was designed with the intention of "testing the myths about marital satisfaction" (Terman et al. 1938, in Gottman, 1979, p. 2). The value of their research was in indicating the importance of looking at variables that described the marital relationship rather than at individual personality variables of spouses in order to predict marital satisfaction. Another historical study which has significance for the study of marital relationships today is Locke's (1951) 1950 study in which he compared two groups: one divorced and one "happily married." Of major importance in Locke's early study was that it also revealed that the important variables in determining marital satisfaction were variables which described the marital relationship and that spouses' perceptions of each other and of the relationship were key. In Gottman's (1979) book on marital interaction,



he described that research in sociology, family systems, developmental psychology, and social learning areas have all contributed to current research in marital relationships and marital satisfaction. He indicated that these varied research traditions contributed findings which indicated that a good deal of the variance in predicting marital satisfaction could be accounted for by observing the communication style of a couple as the couple resolved conflict. They also contributed findings that a couple's perception of how well their spouses fulfill their marital expectations was another very important variable in the prediction of marital satisfaction. These research traditions also contributed the notion of the importance of the interdependence of spouses behaviors and of their perceptions. It is accepted, then, that in examining marital satisfaction, important areas to examine are the interdependence of the spouses in relationship, their communication, and their perceptions.

In the study of interpersonal perception in marriage various disciplines using corresponding varied methodologies have generally supported the theory that congruence of perception between spouses is related to marital satisfaction. Accordingly, distorted or incongruent perception is related to marital dissatisfaction (Sillers, 1985). It is accepted that adequate intimacy is also important to marital satisfaction (Waring et al., 1981), and

some studies have found a relationship between level of marital intimacy and spouses' self-disclosure (Waring et al. 1981). It is generally believed that spouses' self-disclosure and communication are related to spouses' perception and to spouses' marital satisfaction (Waring, 1988; Gottman et al, 1976; Beck, 1988). Few have examined the relation between interpersonal perception and intimacy.

### Interpersonal Perception

In a review of research on interpersonal perception, Sillers (1985) states,

the theory of interpersonal perception is as diffuse as the research literature, [and] studies of interpersonal perception within personal relationships are so scattered that a common agenda addressing basic issues has yet to evolve. . . . Consequently, relatively little insight has been shed on interpersonal perception within personal relationships beyond [general outlines.]" (pp. 277-278)

Sillers reviewed research from a number of different disciplines and reports that research suggests "that a general dimension of distorted, inaccurate, or incongruent perception differentiates incompatible relationships from happy, well-adjusted ones" (p. 277). Researchers have examined such areas as spouses' communication, attributions, "similarity," and "understanding" as they relate to interpersonal perception and to marital satisfaction.

Early theorizing and research in interpersonal perception by Dymond (1954) and Laing et al. (1966) established some definitions and methods which have been used

in much of the research in interpersonal perception since that time and are still currently used in some form. The methodology involved having a couple complete an assessment instrument for themselves and then again as they thought their spouse would answer. (Dymond had spouses answer selected questions from the MMPI, and Laing et al. created a questionnaire related to relationships.) Laing et al. added one other prediction for couples to make: Each spouse answered how s/he thinks his or her spouse will answer for him/her. Dymond labelled what she measured "empathy" or "understanding" which is "the extent to which one individual perceives another as the latter perceives himself" by comparing one spouse's predicted answers for the other with the other's actual answers (1954, p. 164). She measured what she termed "assumed similarity" by measuring "the congruence between the descriptions given by one spouse of him/herself and his/her description of the other spouse" (1954, p. 16). "Similarity" was measured by the congruence between the actual MMPI scores of the individuals. Laing et al. described a "spiral of reciprocal perspectives" in which "one or both persons . . . may spiral off into third, fourth, or even fifth levels of what we have suggested may be called metaperspectives" (1966, p. 23). For example, Laing et al. said, "My field of experience is, however, filled not only by my direct view of myself (ego), and of the other (alter), but of . . . my view of the other's . . . view of me" (1966, p.

4). Laing et al. (1966) determined what they labelled spouses "agreement" or "disagreement" on issues by examining the concordance of the spouses' personal, individual scores. They determined what they called "understanding" by comparing one spouse's direct view with the other spouse's metaperspective, which is that spouse's view of the other's view of an issue. They determined what they called "feeling of being understood" by comparing one spouse's direct perspective with his/her metaperspective, i.e., what the first spouse thinks his/her spouse's view of the first spouse's view of the issue.

The point of the above detail is to remind one of the complexity of interpersonal relationships and of the complexity of perceptions in interpersonal relationships and of the necessary complexity of research and of assessment instruments involved in gaining understanding of them. Sillers (1985) stressed that "the study of interpersonal perception should call attention to the interpersonal and interdependent nature of perceptions within relationships" (p. 279). The methodologies of Dymond (1954) and Laing et al. (1966) methodologies attempted to account for individuals and for individuals within relationships.

Laing et al. (1966) found that their assessment differentiated between couples in disturbed and nondisturbed marriages, with couples in nondisturbed marriages evincing less "disjunction" or more "concordance" of perceptions.

They found couples with disturbed relationships to be in "more disagreement, have more misunderstanding," and to "feel misunderstood"--but correctly so, because they actually were misunderstood. Dymond (1954) found significant differences between happily married couples and unhappily married couples in "understanding," meaning that happily married spouses were more accurate in predicting how their mates would respond to selected questions from the MMPI. She found that marital happiness and "accuracy of perception" were significantly correlated. Dymond also found that happily married spouses were significantly more similar than were unhappily married couples. She found no relationship between "assumed similarity" and marital happiness.

Research in interpersonal perception has utilized methodology similar to that outlined by Laing et al. (1966) and Dymond (1954), most often utilizing different assessment instruments to measure such things as congruence of spouses' perceptions of expected roles, congruence of spouses' perceptions of their communication, and congruence of spouses' perceptions of attitudes and situations. Numerous studies have found a significant positive relationship between measures of congruence of perceptions and/or marital satisfaction (Arias & O'Leary, 1985; Ferguson & Allen, 1978; Fields, 1983; Genshaft, 1980; Newmark et al., 1977). Several studies have found significant associations between actual similarity of spouses and marital satisfaction (Dymond, 1954;

Newmark et al., 1977; White & Hatcher, 1984). Some studies have found gender differences in the relationship of perceptual congruence to marital satisfaction. Luckey (1960) found that marital satisfaction was significantly related to congruence of the husband's perception of himself with his wife's perception of him. Utilizing ratings of role expectation on the Interpersonal Checklist, Kotlar (1965) found a number of significant differences between husbands and wives and between satisfied and unsatisfied spouses. She found that congruence of perception was significantly related to the husband's and the couple's marital adjustment score but not to the wife's marital adjustment score. Bochner, Krueger, and Chmielewski (1982) found that accuracy of perception of role expectation did not relate to marital satisfaction but that there was a significant negative association between husbands' metaperceptions and marital satisfaction. A discrepancy between a husband's role expectation and the wife's actual role enactment correlated negatively with marital satisfaction. Plechaty (1987) found, generally, that satisfied spouses differed significantly from dissatisfied spouses in perceptual congruence of attitudes and situations related to marriage. Satisfied spouses had significantly more congruence of perceptions. He found that wives were more accurate in predicting husbands' responses and that wives' accuracy was significantly related to marital satisfaction.

In his review of research related to interpersonal perception in relationships, Sillers (1985) cited some methodological problems with the research on interpersonal perception and understanding (cited in Cronbach, 1955). One issue was the way various scores were computed which resulted in confounding of scores in some studies. Cronbach discussed the problems inherent in "giving psychological interpretation to mathematical artifacts" (1955, p. 177). For example, Cronbach discussed problems in labeling such constructs as "understanding," "similarity," "accuracy of perception" based upon one spouse predicting how another would respond. He posited that these scores included various sources of variation and are uninterpretable as such constructs. Sillers et al. (1984) conducted research taking into account the methodological problems by attempting to operationalize the concept of "understanding" between spouses and aimed at addressing the issue of the effect of communication on understanding and marital compatibility. Their results differed greatly from most of the previous research. Sillers et al. stressed the preliminary nature of their studies; however, they noted that the results suggested that

spouses are not highly accurate at judging certain perceptions held by their partners; previous studies have probably overgeneralized the relation between understanding and compatibility in marriage, spouses make inferential biases in their perceptions of communication, and perception influences the relationship between understanding, communication, and marital satisfaction. (p. 293)

It is important to note that other researchers have also taken into account the problems with methodology (Dymond, 1954; Newmark et al., 1977; Tiggie et al., 1982) and have still found significant associations between congruence of spouses' perceptions or "understanding" and marital satisfaction. Another major methodological problem which plagues research in this area is the use of different assessment instruments in different studies.

Sillers (1985) and others have related research in interpersonal perception and research in interpersonal attributions. Sillers quoted Heider (1958) to define attributions as "constructs used by naive social actors to describe, explain, and predict social interaction" (p. 279). Generally, the attributional literature which deals with attributions in marriage examines spouses' attributions of traits or motives to each other or with the assignation of blame for conflict. Sillers described attribution and "understanding" (as defined by researchers in interpersonal perception) as being interdependent but separate phenomena. Bradbury and Fincham (1990), in an article on attributions in marriage, stressed that there is a distinction between attributions and interpersonal perception, citing that attribution research is more concerned with "explanations for relationship events." Certain aspects of the research on attributions are relevant to the present discussion.



Sillers (1985) cited numerous studies in interpersonal perception in marriage which indicate that "understanding" is not necessarily related to marital satisfaction but that the congruence of perceptions is primary. Attributional research supports this notion (Baucom et al., 1989; Bradbury & Fincham, 1990). These authors have pointed out that in order to judge accuracy of perception, one would need readily objectifiable norms against which to judge, and such criteria do not exist. Baucom et al. (1989) found that differences in attributions between distressed and nondistressed spouses are indicative of different psychological processes and do not mirror an external reality: The differences are evident when the same standard stimuli events are presented to such spouses.

Sillers (1985) summarized studies on attributions in marital relationships as supporting general "attributional biases" and "actor-observer differences" typically found in research on attributions. However, the literature on attributions in relation to marital satisfaction indicates that there are greater attributional differences between spouses in conflictual versus nonconflictual relationships. "Dissatisfied spouses are more blaming of each other than are satisfied spouses," and dissatisfied spouses are also more discrepant in attributions of intent of communication than are satisfied spouses (p. 286). Bradbury and Fincham (1990) found that the research on attributions in marriage generally

supported these findings. They stated that "dissatisfied spouses, compared with satisfied spouses, make attributions for the partner's behavior that cast it in a negative light" (1990, p. 1). There also appear to be gender differences in the relationship between attributional bias and marital satisfaction, but none are consistent. Sillers (1985) cited several studies indicating gender differences in the relationship between attributions and marital satisfaction, reporting that wives' attributions were "responsible" for the relationship between "attributions for blame and conflict" and "marital satisfaction" (pp. 286-287). Sillers reported that marital counseling programs had been developed on the assumption that faulty attributions caused marital problems. However, Sillers (1985) and Bradbury and Fincham (1990) have pointed out that one can make no causal implications based on research to date. Bradbury and Fincham pointed out that researchers have posited two contrary causal theories: that attributions causally influence marital satisfaction and that the emotional tone of interpersonal relationships causally influences the attributions that occur. For the purposes of this study, the significantly greater incongruence of perceptions for dissatisfied spouses cited in the attributional research is of interest.

#### Intimacy

Intimacy has been identified as an important aspect of marriage. It has been found that there is a significant

correlation between level of intimacy and marital adjustment (Waring et al., 1981). The importance of intimacy has also been revealed in studies linking lack of optimal marital intimacy to depression and other nonpsychotic emotional illness (Essex et al., 1985; Waring, 1982). In his early research, Waring et al. (1981) operationally defined intimacy as "a psychological process within a marital relationship [which is] determined in part by strong ego identity, disengagement from the family of origin, and accurate perception of spouse" (p. 169). Accurate perception was measured by comparing spouses' ratings of themselves and each other on an adjective checklist. Waring et al. (1981) found that accurate spousal perception was significantly correlated with "intimacy" as measured by the "affection" scale of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations Orientation Scale (FIRO-B) (Schultz, 1960). Affection on this instrument is defined as "a spouse's effort to become close and express friendly and affectionate feelings and try to be personal and intimate." Waring and Reddon (1983) found intimacy to be a multidimensional construct which is in itself a "primary dimension" in the prediction of marital satisfaction. A number of studies examined the relationship of self-disclosure to marital intimacy (Chelune et al., 1984; Waring et al., 1981; Waring & Chelune, 1983). It was posited that self-disclosure and intimacy are not synonymous but that self-disclosure is "a major determinant" of intimacy (Waring

& Chelune, 1983). Several authors have found significant relationships between self-disclosure and marital satisfaction (Chelune et al., 1984; Davidson et al., 1983; Dean & Lucas, 1978; Waring & Chelune, 1983). In later studies, Waring and Chelune (1983) and Chelune et al. (1984) utilized the Self-Disclosure Coding System (Chelune 1975) and, through a series of stepwise regression analyses, found that self-disclosing behaviors accounted for 50% of the variance in composite intimacy scores. They reported that the four facets or dimensions of intimacy most influenced by self-disclosure were "compatibility," defined as "the sharing of background, attitudes, activities, and goals"; "intimate behaviors," undefined; "identity," defined as the couple's opinions about themselves compared to other couples"; and "expressiveness," defined as "the sharing of private thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes, as well as the capacity to communicate about the relationship" (Waring & Chelune, 1983, p. 184). Chelune (in Waring, 1988) defined self-disclosure as "a process of making ourselves known to other people by verbally revealing personal information." Waring (1988) has developed a short-term marital therapy program based on what he calls "cognitive self-disclosure." Several preliminary studies suggest this therapy results in decreases in nonpsychotic emotional illness and results in increases in intimacy and marital satisfaction. Other theorists have stressed approaches to marital therapy which emphasize

communication skills aimed at increasing understanding and intimacy (Beck, 1988; Gottman et al., 1976). Beck (1988) posits that "how one spouse perceives and interprets what the other does can be far more important in determining marital satisfaction than those actions themselves" and emphasizes that his cognitive approach to marital therapy "focuses on the way [dissatisfied] mates perceive, misperceive, . . . and fail to perceive each other, and the way they communicate, miscommunicate, and fail to communicate (pp. 17-18)."

Gottman et al. (1976) based their model of marital communication therapy on numerous marital interaction research studies (see Gottman, 1979; Gottman & Krokoff, 1989; Gottman & Levenson, 1986; and Levenson & Gottman, 1983, for complete reviews of this research). Gottman et al. (1976) stated that in their research they have attempted "to describe systematically what it is nondistressed couples do differently than distressed couples to resolve marital conflict and how they themselves perceive the messages they exchange." In general, Gottman et al. (1976) suggest that their studies supported a "communication deficit explanation of marital distress" (p. xv). Results indicated significant differences between maritally satisfied and maritally dissatisfied spouses. They measured the spouses' ratings of the positivity of their communicative intent as well as the impact of their spouses' communication on them. There were no between-group differences for satisfied and dissatisfied

husbands and wives in positivity of intent; however, distressed husbands and wives indicated significantly less positive impact of their spouses' communication than that of satisfied husbands and wives.

Intimacy has been related to marital satisfaction, and it has been suggested that self-disclosure accounts for much of the variance in composite intimacy scores on the Waring Intimacy Questionnaire (Waring & Chelune, 1983). What has been called self-disclosure and communication and "accurate perception" and spousal "understanding" have also been related to marital satisfaction. Intimacy is a term which has been used by many theorists in the field of marital research and therapy, and it has recently been operationally defined and in several carefully designed studies has been found to be a multifaceted construct predictive of marital satisfaction (Waring & Reddon, 1983). Although numerous theorists link interpersonal perception to intimacy, few have examined the relationship between spousal perception and intimacy using valid and reliable instruments.

#### Interpersonal Assessment

Laing et al. (1966), Sillers (1985), and a number of others have emphasized the complexity and interdependence of interpersonal relationships. Others have stressed their view of the value of the development of a system of measurement of interpersonal phenomena for the purpose of scholarly investigation, for assessment, for diagnosis, and for

treatment (Benjamin, 1974; Carson, 1969; Leary, 1957). (See Wiggins (1982) for a review of interpersonal assessment models.). The models of interpersonal measurement that these authors proposed were circumplex models. The early circumplex models were basically circular representations of interpersonal behavior along two axes (Wiggins, 1982). Leary (1957), who was among the first to develop an interpersonal classification system, described these axes as dimensions of power and affiliation. Others described the axes as dimensions of "Dominance vs. Submission" and "Love vs. Hate" or a continuum of "Control" and a continuum of "Affection" (Wiggins, 1982). In theory, descriptors at points along the axes and around the circumplex represented various empirical combinations of the dimensions represented by the axes, adjacent descriptors being more highly correlated than descriptors which are nonadjacent. In most circumplex models, the descriptors at either end of the axes or at either end of a diagonal of the interpersonal circumplex tend to be bipolar opposites. Leary (1957) added to these dimensions a theory of "levels" of measurement. He proposed that each dimension be measured at five different levels: public level, conscious level, private level, level of the unexpressed, and level of values. Others added the notion of a direction of social perception or behavior such as acting toward self or other. Theoretically, it is possible to code

any interpersonal behavior according to these various aspects (Wiggins, 1982).

Benjamin (1974) has developed and refined an empirically sound and theoretically sophisticated system of interpersonal assessment. The Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (SASB) is a circumplex model which allows description of perception of interpersonal behavior along two axes which measure degree of affiliation or interdependence and on three "surfaces" which measure a focus of an interpersonal event: focus toward other, which involves transitive action; focus on self, which involves intransitive action or a reactive state; and an interpsychic focus which accounts for an introjection of how other treats self. Benjamin (1974) points out that the notion of introjection or that "one treats oneself the way one has been treated by significant others" is supported by psychoanalytic as well as sociological theorists (p. 397). She describes parental behavior as being prototypic of transitive action described by the first surface ("doing something to, for, or about the other person" (p. 128)). She describes children's behavior as being prototypic of intransitive action. This second surface or focus was designed to describe actions "complementary" to the first surface, and, although complementary behaviors are supposed to "invite" each other, neither is considered more important or more "responsible" in an interpersonal interaction.



On all three surfaces the horizontal axis represents degree of affiliation. Points along the axis in each direction measure degree of affiliation, from zero to positive or negative nine. Positive affiliation scores measure degree of hostility; negative affiliation scores measure degree of friendliness. The vertical axis on all three surfaces measures degree of interdependence, ranging from autonomy or independence at the extreme negative point on the axis to enmeshment at the extreme positive point on the axis. Benjamin's (1974, 1984) system includes definitions and measurement of complementarity, opposites, and antithesis of interpersonal behaviors. Complementarity, as mentioned earlier, reflects behavior coded on the same points of the circumplex on different surfaces, e.g., submissive behavior on surface two is the complement of dominant behavior on surface one. Opposite behaviors are represented by points which are 180 degrees from each other on the same surface, e.g., emancipate is the opposite of dominate. The antithesis of a behavior is defined as "opposite to the complement" of a behavior (1984, p. 135). One might want to attempt an antithetical behavior if one wanted to change the behavior of someone acting toward oneself by "inviting" them to act in a complementary way, e.g., the antithesis of "intrudes, blocks, restricts person" is "assert on own" which has the complement "you can do it fine" (1984, p. 135).

The SASB has been designed to be utilized in direct behavioral coding or with self-report questionnaires which can be used by any number of "significant others" in the present or past tense. The self-report measures enable one to utilize a computer scoring program which scores individual answers and creates a plot or a pattern which it compares with 21 different theoretical curves and indicates with which curve the data correlate most highly. This enables one to indicate with a psychological label the nature of the relationship, e.g., Ambivalent, Control, Self-love. Three scores, called Pattern coefficients, are also computed. They indicate the degree to which the data are located along the horizontal (affiliation) axis or the vertical (interdependence) axis. They reflect the extent to which the relationship is characterized by each dimension. These are called the "Attack Pattern," the "Control Pattern," and the "Conflict Pattern." Scores for the Attack Pattern indicate to what extent the relationship is characterized by scores falling along the horizontal axis of affiliation. Negative Attack coefficients indicate the extent to which behaviors fall on the affectionate pole of the horizontal axis. Positive Attack coefficients indicate the extent to which behaviors fall on the attack pole of the horizontal axis. Scores for the Control Pattern indicate to what extent the relationship is characterized by scores falling on the vertical axis of interdependence. Negative Control

coefficients indicate the extent to which behaviors fall on the autonomy pole of the vertical axis. Positive Control coefficients indicate the extent to which behaviors fall on the enmeshment pole of the vertical axis. Conflict coefficients indicate the extent to which an individual endorsed behaviors which fell at both opposing poles of either axis. Positive Conflict coefficients indicate the extent to which behaviors consistently fall on both interdependency and autonomy dimensions of the vertical axis. Negative Conflict coefficients indicate the extent to which behaviors consistently fall on both affection and attack dimensions of the horizontal axis (see Appendix A for examples of SASB items).

Benjamin (1988) stressed that the SASB measures perception. She indicated that interobserver discrepancies in perception may be clinically important information and that "it is important to measure and to compare and contrast different perceptions when trying to make interpersonal diagnoses" (p. 45). Although Benjamin describes the SASB as a clinical instrument, its relevance for nonclinical populations has been demonstrated in her research.

One of the problems often cited in research in interpersonal perception is the lack of consistency in instruments used and of what is being measured. The SASB offers a well-validated and empirically sound instrument designed specifically to evaluate perception of behavior in

interpersonal relationships. Its use in this type of research could certainly be of benefit.

The SASB has been used most frequently with clinical populations, primarily with patients, their families, and therapists. Despite its apparent applicability, it has been used only several times in assessing aspects of marital relationships. Essex et al. (1985) utilized the SASB in two related studies to assess the relationship of the perceived quality of their intimate relationships to depression in older women. Controlling for age, education, income, and marital status, the authors found that some interpersonal dimensions of the women's significant relationships predicted depression. They compared the women's perceptions of their own behavior toward their spouse or significant other in their relationships to their perceptions of the behavior of their spouse or significant other to themselves. Generally, women, who saw their spouses or significant other as being less friendly and affectionate than themselves and as being less consistent than they, were more depressed. (In this study, the authors labeled the interpersonal dimensions as "perceived intimacy," although the SASB has not been related to any independent measure of intimacy.) In another study, Chiles et al. (1980) utilized the SASB and certain other measures to compare two groups of couples who presented to a clinic with problems of sexual dysfunction: One group had a member who was alcoholic and the other did not. Results

indicated that in both groups husbands saw themselves as being more friendly and giving than did wives. Wives saw themselves as acting more negatively toward their spouses. Between group differences in interpersonal patterns of relating were significant. Also of particular interest are results indicating a significant discrepancy in perceptions of husbands and wives in the group with the alcoholic member. Husbands saw themselves as significantly more submissive than did wives. The authors point out the clinical usefulness of utilizing the SASB in such interpersonal assessment.

Apparently the SASB, which allows systematic examination of husbands' and wives' perceptions of their own and their spouses behavior in their relationship, is capable of differentiating subtle interpersonal differences in both nonclinical and clinical populations.

#### Methodological Issues

Some methodological issues in past research in interpersonal perception involved researcher's attempts to explore interpersonal factors and taking sums or differences of scores on a variety of instruments and labelling them such things as "understanding," "empathy," "similarity," and "accuracy of perception." Cronbach (1955) and Kenny (1988) have pointed out that various sources of variance enter into such scores which may have nothing to do with the construct authors attempted to define. In this study, no attempt was made to define discrepancy in interpersonal perception as

other than it was. Interpersonal perception here is operationally defined as a spouse's perception of him or herself and of his/her spouse in relationship (treating or behaving toward each other) for various general relationship conditions.

### Hypotheses

General findings in the marital literature show that discrepancies in perceptions between husbands and wives have been related to marital dissatisfaction and congruence of interpersonal perceptions has been related to marital satisfaction. Marital intimacy has been found to be positively related to marital satisfaction. Two general hypotheses regarding these findings will be analyzed in this study. The first hypothesis proposes that congruence of interpersonal perception of spouses' will be positively related to marital intimacy. The second hypothesis concerns the intra-dyadic differences revealed in this literature. It is proposed that there will be intra-dyadic differences in the relation of interpersonal perception to intimacy. The nature of those differences will be explored. Parallel relationships between interpersonal perception and marital satisfaction will also be explored. Congruence of perception ought to predict marital satisfaction.

Some studies have proposed that similarity between husbands and wives is related to marital satisfaction. The third hypothesis of this study proposes that greater

similarities of spouses' responses on the SASB will be related to marital satisfaction.

## CHAPTER 2 METHOD

### Subjects

Fifty-nine ( $n=118$ ) married couples participated in the study. Subjects were solicited from various sources in and around the Gainesville, Florida, area. Notices were placed at various local stores, employment sites, on various bulletin boards around the campuses, and student housing sites of the University of Florida and of Santa Fe Community College. Members of local social and religious organizations were recruited by mail, as were friends and acquaintances of friends of the author. Subjects were screened to exclude couples who were currently in marital therapy, and a clinical instrument, the Beck Depression Inventory, was used to exclude subjects with obvious depression. Thirty-three of the 59 couples who participated in this study became subjects in a second marital study, not a part of this project. These 33 subjects were fully aware of the integrity of this particular research and only subsequently, on completing these research requirements, entered into the second project. These subjects were not identified as a distinct subset for purposes of analyses. These couples filled out the questionnaires pertaining to the present study prior to



participation in the second study. The other 26 couples participated in the present study only. Subjects were offered \$25.00 compensation or contribution to a charity of their choice for their participation. They were also offered general feedback regarding results of the study.

### Instruments

#### Demographic Questionnaire

A questionnaire was used to obtain information regarding age, sex, years of education, years of marriage, number of children, and other pertinent information. Mean age of husbands' was 36.7 years; mean age of wives' was 35.6 years. Mean years of education of husbands' was 16.6 years; mean years of education of wives' was 16.1 years. There were no significant differences between husbands and wives on these two variables. Mean years married was 10.08 years (S.D. 12.1, Range 3/4 year-50 years). Mean number of children was .99 (S.D. 1.1, Range 0-4 children).

Table 1

#### Demographic Variables

|          | Age  |      |       | Years Ed. |      |       |
|----------|------|------|-------|-----------|------|-------|
|          | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean      | S.D. | Range |
| Husbands | 36.7 | 21.0 | 23-70 | 16.6      | 3.0  | 11-28 |
| Wives    | 35.9 | 11.6 | 21-69 | 16.1      | 2.6  | 12-22 |

### Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (SASB)

Three scores of the Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (SASB) (Benjamin, 1988) were used as independent variables. The SASB is an instrument designed to assess both perception of oneself and of one's significant others in relationships. Numerous studies utilizing factor analyses, discriminant functions, and auto correlations have shown adequate reliability and validity and have shown that the SASB discriminates between normal and clinical samples. Norms are given for a college student sample (Benjamin, 1988). The SASB measure was used to describe the subject's perception of interpersonal relationships. This instrument classifies ratings of interpersonal relations in terms of focus on self, other, or introjection and in terms of affiliation and interdependence, and scores are correlated with 21 theoretical pattern profiles. These profiles are related to psychological names describing actions such as "give autonomy." The SASB scores are also summarized in any of three patterns according to the extent the theoretical pattern profiles center on either of the two dimensions (affiliation dimension/interdependence dimension) of the circumplex model. These summary scores yield coefficients for an Attack dimension, a Control dimension, and a Conflict dimension in relationships. For the purpose of this study, these dimension scores for particular interpersonal focuses were used as the independent variables.

### The Waring Intimacy Questionnaire (WIQ)

The Waring Intimacy Questionnaire (WIQ) (Waring & Reddon, 1983) was used as a dependent measure. The WIQ is a 90-item true/false inventory designed to assess levels of intimacy in a marriage. Examples of items on this questionnaire are "I enjoy sharing my feelings with my spouse" and "our sexual relationship influences our level of closeness." The questionnaire yields a total intimacy score which has been shown to discriminate adequately between satisfied and unsatisfied spouses, and the WIQ shows significant convergent validity with other measures of intimacy. In addition to a total intimacy score, the measure yields eight subscales which have been derived by factor analyses: affection, cohesion, expressiveness, compatibility, conflict resolution, sexuality, autonomy, and identity. Test-retest reliability of these individual scales ranges from .73 to .90. Internal consistency reliability on the individual scales ranged from .52 to .87. For this study, significant convergent validity was also established between the affection subscale of the WIQ and a behavioral measure of affectionate behaviors, the SOCP (correlation of .37,  $p < .001$ ).

### The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS)

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) (Spanier, 1976) was used as a dependent measure. The DAS is a 32-item scale designed to assess dyadic satisfaction. The DAS has shown

content validity, construct validity (correlation of .86 with the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale), and criterion-related validity (divorced sample and married sample differed significantly  $p < .001$ ). Reliability was determined for each of four subscales and total scale score (subscales were later shown not to hold). Factor analyses by other researchers failed to produce the subscales, although subsequent research upheld the validity of the overall scale score of dyadic adjustment (Antill & Cotton, 1982; Kazak et al., 1988; Sharpley & Cross, 1982; Spanier, 1988; Thompson, 1988). Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency for total scale score was .96.

#### Beck Depression Inventory

The Beck Depression Inventory (Beck et al., 1961) was used to rule out psychopathology. Items for the inventory were derived from clinical observation of behavior and attitudes of depressed patients, which were consistent with descriptions of depression in psychiatric texts. Internal consistency was established by split-half reliability analysis which yielded a reliability coefficient of .86. Convergent validity was established by significant correlations with psychiatrists' clinical judgement. Additional validity was shown by correct prediction of changes in depth of depression in 85% of clinical cases studied.

### Spouse Observation Checklist

The Affectionate Behaviors Subscale of Weiss et al.'s (1973) Spouse Observation Checklist was used as a measure to establish convergent validity of intimacy (see Appendix B). Weiss (in a personal communication, July, 1991) suggested using a score of total pleasurable behaviors as the score for this use of the subscale. Couples were asked to record their spouse's affectionate behaviors nightly for a 2-week period. Examples of items on this brief behavior rating scale are "Spouse greeted me warmly" and "We warmed each other in bed." Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency was established as .94.

### Procedure

Upon volunteering for the study, subjects were scheduled to come to a specific room to complete a packet of questionnaires at one seating. To avoid any systematic sensitizing of subjects to self-monitoring of intimacy behaviors on the Spouse Observation Checklist, half of the subjects received the 2-week behavioral rating scale to complete before their scheduled meeting and half received the behavioral rating scale to complete after their scheduled meeting and returned it by mail. Subjects were informed that their participation in the study was confidential, and they were given consent forms to fill out. Instructions for the questionnaires were given to each couple before they began.

Payment for participation was given upon completion of all of the questionnaires and the behavioral rating scales.

### Analyses

To explore the first two hypotheses of couples' discrepancies of interpersonal perception and of differences between the genders in discrepancies in interpersonal perception and their relation to marital intimacy, differences in husband's and wife's interpersonal perception were computed. These computations involved taking the absolute value of differences in husband's and wife's scores on the Attack, Control, and Conflict dimensions on selected focuses of the SASB. Discrepancy scores were derived by taking these differences between two different interpersonal focuses of the spouses: (a) "focus toward other" [(e.g., "When the relationship is at its best, I treat my significant other in a particular manner," (which results in particular scores on the Attack, Control, and Conflict dimensions)); and (b) "other focuses toward me" [(e.g., "When the relationship is at its best, my significant other treats me in a particular manner," (which results in particular scores on the Attack, Control, and Conflict dimensions)]. These discrepancy scores were used to assess how husbands and wives each perceived a particular relationship situation. For example, a husband's scores on the Attack, Control, and Conflict dimensions for the focus, "When the relationship is at its best, I treat my wife in a particular manner," were

compared with his wife's scores on the Attack, Control, and Conflict dimensions for the focus "For the relationship at best, my significant other treats me in a particular manner." Following is a table indicating interpersonal focus and the abbreviation used to represent it hereafter in the text.

Table 2

Interpersonal Focus Variables Used in Analyses

| Variable<br>Abbreviation | Interpersonal Focuses   |
|--------------------------|---|
| BH                       | Relationship at best, husband's report, "I treat my wife," compared with wife's report, "my significant other treats me."     |
| BW                       | Relationship at best, wife's report, "I treat my husband, compared with husband's report, "my significant other treats me."   |
| WH                       | Relationship at worst, husband's report, "I treat my wife," compared with wife's report, "my significant other treats me."    |
| WW                       | Relationship at worst, wife's report, "I treat my husband," compared with husband's report, "my significant other treats me." |

The first hypothesis was explored by doing stepwise regression analyses of these discrepancies in husband's and wife's interpersonal perception to predict marital intimacy as measured by the Total Intimacy score of the Waring Intimacy Questionnaire (WIQ). Separate regressions (as

recommended by Benjamin, 1988) were done for the relationship as characterized "at best" and "at worst."

The second hypothesis regarding gender differences in response was explored by doing the regression analyses separately for husband's and for wife's Total Intimacy scores of the WIQ. Parallel regression analyses of spousal discrepancies of interpersonal perception in relation to marital satisfaction were also done.

The third hypothesis regarding similarities between spouses was examined by computing differences (the absolute value of the differences) in husband's and wife's scores on the same interpersonal focus of the SASB [(e.g., "When the relationship is at it's best, I treat my significant other in a particular manner," (which results in particular scores on the Attack, Control, and Conflict dimensions of the SASB)]. Similarity in spouses' reported behavior in a particular relationship situation were assessed using these difference scores. A stepwise regression analysis was used to assess the degree to which the similarity of husband's and wife's responses on the Attack, Control, and Conflict scores of the SASB predict marital satisfaction as measured by the DAS.



### CHAPTER 3 RESULTS

Two measures were used as dependent measures: the Waring Intimacy Questionnaire (WIQ) and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS). Mean scores for husbands were as follows: WIQ=25.2 (S.D.=4.9), DAS=107.5 (S.D.=14.3). These scores are comparable with mean scores of published norms for similar samples (WIQ=25.4, S.D.=4.6; DAS=114.8, S.D.=17.8) (Spanier, 1976; Waring & Reddon, 1981). Mean scores for wives were as follows: WIQ=26.2 (S.D.=4.8), DAS=107.6 (S.D.=12.1). These scores are also comparable with mean scores of published norms for similar samples (WIQ=25.3, S.D.=4.3; DAS=114.8, S.D.=17.8) (Spanier, 1976; Waring & Reddon, 1981). Paired difference t-tests indicated that there were no significant differences between husbands' and wives' scores on these measures.

A series of stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed to test the three hypotheses of the study. These analyses, followed by confirmatory setwise regression analyses, yielded information regarding the relationship between the interpersonal perception variables and marital intimacy and marital satisfaction. They yielded information regarding which interpersonal perception variable or which

Table 3

Dependent Measures

|          | WIQ  |      |       | DAS   |      |        |
|----------|------|------|-------|-------|------|--------|
|          | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean  | S.D. | Range  |
| Husbands | 25.2 | 4.8  | 12-34 | 107.5 | 14.3 | 73-148 |
| Wives    | 26.2 | 4.8  | 11-34 | 107.6 | 12.1 | 76-129 |

linear combination of interpersonal perception variables explained most of the variance in marital intimacy and marital satisfaction for the relationship at its best and at its worst. In all cases, the significant equations determined by stepwise regression to be the best prediction equation were the same equations selected by a setwise analysis as the best possible equation with that particular number of variables, indicating that the variables chosen were most predictive of the dependent variable. Significance level for inclusion in the regression equation was set at .15.

To analyze the first hypothesis regarding congruence of spouses' interpersonal perceptions related to marital intimacy, regression equations to predict both husband's and wife's scores on the WIQ for the relationship at its best and at its worst were explored. Three of four analyses generated significant relationships of independent variables to the dependent variable.

For the relationship at its best there were significant models which predicted both husband's and wife's total intimacy scores. Husband's total intimacy score (WIQ) was inversely related to discrepancies in three interpersonal perception variables (SASB). A discrepancy in the way a husband perceived himself treating his wife and the way his wife perceived him as treating her (BH) on the Control dimension of the SASB and discrepancies in the way a wife perceived herself treating her husband and the way he perceived her treating him (BW) on the Attack and Conflict dimensions of the SASB were inversely related to husband's total intimacy score ( $R^2 = .15$ ,  $F(3,55)=3.4$ ,  $p<.05$ ) (see Table 4).

Table 4

Significant Regression Model Predicting Husband's Total Intimacy Score at Best

| Independent Variable | Standard Regression Weight | Partial $R^2$ | Cumulative $R^2$ | F    |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|------|
| BH-Control           | -.23                       | .07           | .07              | 4.2* |
| BW-Conflict          | -.20                       | .05           | .12              | 3.2  |
| BW-Attack            | -.20                       | .04           | .16              | 2.4  |

\* $p<.05$

Wife's total intimacy score (WIQ) was inversely related to a discrepancy in two interpersonal perception variables (SASB).

A discrepancy in the way a wife perceived herself treating her husband and the way he perceived her treating him (BW) on the Attack and Conflict dimensions of the SASB was inversely related to wife's total intimacy ( $R^2 = .16$ ,  $F(2,56)=5.1$ ,  $p<.01$ ) (see Table 5).

Table 5

Significant Regression Model Predicting Wife's Total Intimacy Score at Best

| Independent Variable | Standard Regression Weight | Partial $R^2$ | Cumulative $R^2$ | F    |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|------|
| BW-Attack            | -.28                       | .09           | .09              | 5.4* |
| BW-Conflict          | -.26                       | .07           | .16              | 4.5* |

\* $p<.05$

For the relationship at its worst, there was a significant model which predicted wife's total intimacy (WIQ). Wife's total intimacy score was inversely related to a discrepancy between her perception of how she treated her husband and how he perceived her to treat him (WW) on the Attack and Conflict dimensions of the SASB ( $R^2 = .11$ ,  $F(2,56)=3.6$ ,  $p<.05$ ) (see Table 6). Although the model was not significant ( $R^2 = .06$ ,  $F(1,57)=3.7$ ,  $p<.058$ ), husband's total intimacy score was inversely related to a discrepancy in the way he perceived himself treating his wife and how she

perceived him treating her (WH) on the Attack dimension of the SASB.

Table 6

Significant Regression Model Predicting Wife's Total Intimacy Score at Worst

| Independent Variable | Standard Regression Weight | Partial R <sup>2</sup> | Cumulative R <sup>2</sup> | F   |
|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| WW-Attack            | -.30                       | .06                    | .06                       | 3.8 |
| WW-Conflict          | -.23                       | .05                    | .11                       | 3.1 |

Considering the second hypothesis regarding gender differences in how discrepancies in interpersonal perception related to marital intimacy, it is obvious that discrepancies in interpersonal perception are inversely related to marital intimacy for both husbands and wives. There seem to be differences in specific interpersonal variables which predict either husband's or wife's total intimacy score; however, the differences are not consistent.

A correlation analysis was performed to explore the relationship between intimacy (WIQ) and marital satisfaction (DAS). A significant correlation was found between total marital satisfaction score and total intimacy score, as well as between total marital satisfaction score and each subscale of the intimacy questionnaire (see Table 7).

Table 7

Correlations of Marital Satisfaction and Marital Intimacy

|     | WIQ    | CORES   | AFF     | COH    | SEX   | IDENT  | COMP    | AUTON  | EXPRE   |
|-----|--------|---------|---------|--------|-------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| DAS | .278** | .446*** | .343*** | .242** | .911* | .267** | .551*** | .289** | .422*** |

\*p&lt;.05

\*\*p&lt;.01

\*\*\*p&lt;.001

Notes: DAS = Dyadic Adjustment Scale, WIQ = Waring Intimacy Questionnaire, CORES = Conflict Resolution, AFF = Affection, COH = Cohesion, SEX = secuality, IDENT = Identity, COMP = Compatibility, AUTON = autonomy, EXPRE = Expressiveness.

Regression analyses of the relationship between interpersonal perception and marital satisfaction revealed significant results for the marital relationship at best and at worst. The following results were obtained for the relationship at its best. Husband's marital satisfaction (DAS) was inversely related to a discrepancy in the way he perceived himself treating his wife and the way his wife perceived him treating her (BH) on the Attack dimension of the SASB ( $R^2 = .13$ ,  $F(1,57)=8.8$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Wife's marital satisfaction (DAS) was inversely related to discrepancies in the way her husband perceived himself treating his wife and the way she perceived him treating her (BH) on the Attack and Control dimensions of the SASB, and to a discrepancy in the way a wife perceived herself treating her husband and the way he perceived her treating him (BW) on the Control dimension of the SASB ( $R^2 = .30$ ,  $F(3,55)=8.04$ ,  $p<.001$ ) (see Table 8).

Table 8

Significant Regression Model Predicting Wife's Marital Satisfaction at Best

| Independent Variable | Standard Regression Weight | Partial R <sup>2</sup> | Cumulative R <sup>2</sup> | F     |
|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------|
| BH-Attack            | -.39                       | .14                    | .14                       | 9.9** |
| BH-Control           | -.25                       | .12                    | .26                       | 8.4** |
| BW-Control           | -.22                       | .04                    | .30                       | 3.5*  |

\*p&lt;.05

\*\*p&lt;.01

For the relationship at its worst, significant models were also obtained in the prediction of marital satisfaction by discrepancies in spouses' interpersonal perception. Husband's marital satisfaction (DAS) was inversely related to a discrepancy between his perception of how he treated his wife and her perception of how he treated her (WH) on the Attack and Control dimensions of the SASB ( $R^2 = .16$ ,  $F(2,56)=5.3$ ,  $p<.01$ ) (see Table 9).

Wife's marital satisfaction (DAS) was inversely related to a discrepancy between how her husband perceived himself treating her and how she perceived him treating her (WH) on the Control dimension of the SASB, and to a discrepancy between how she perceived herself treating her husband and how he perceived her treating him (WW) on the Attack

dimension of the SASB ( $R^2 = .19$ ,  $F(2,56) = 6.6$ ,  $p < .01$ ) (see Table 10).

Table 9

Significant Regression Model Predicting Husband's Marital Satisfaction at Worst

| Independent Variable | Standard Regression Weight | Partial $R^2$ | Cumulative $R^2$ | F    |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|------|
| WH-Attack            | -.33                       | .11           | .11              | 7.2* |
| WH-Control           | -.22                       | .05           | .16              | 3.1  |

\* $p < .01$

Table 10

Significant Regression Model Predicting Wife's Marital Satisfaction at Worst

| Independent Variable | Standard Regression Weight | Partial $R^2$ | Cumulative $R^2$ | F    |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|------|
| WH-Control           | -.32                       | .09           | .09              | 5.8* |
| WW-Attack            | -.31                       | .09           | .18              | 6.7* |

\* $p < .05$

Significant results were obtained in exploring the relationship between marital satisfaction and similarity of husband's and wife's responses on the SASB. Differences between husband's and wife's responses on SASB were inversely



related to both husband's and wives' marital satisfaction. The greater the difference, the less the marital satisfaction, or, conversely, the greater the similarity, the more the marital satisfaction.

For the relationship at its best, both husband's and wife's marital satisfaction was inversely related to differences in how they reported themselves treating their spouse. Husband's marital satisfaction (DAS) was inversely related to differences between himself and his wife on the Attack dimension of the SASB ( $R^2 = .10$ ,  $F(1,57)=6.4$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Wife's marital satisfaction (DAS) was inversely related to differences between herself and her husband on the Attack and Control dimensions of the SASB ( $R^2 = .12$ ,  $F(2,56)=3.8$ ,  $p<.05$ ) (see Table 11).

Table 11

Significant Regression Model Predicting Wife's Marital Satisfaction from Spouse Similarity Variables at Best

| Independent Variable | Standard Regression Weight | Partial $R^2$ | Cumulative $R^2$ | F    |
|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|------|
| Similarity-Attack    | -.24                       | .07           | .07              | 4.3* |
| Similarity-Control   | -.22                       | .05           | .12              | 3.1  |

\* $p<.05$

## CHAPTER 4 DISCUSSION

### Introduction

Numerous research studies have established that incongruent, distorted perceptions of one's spouse or of one's marital relationship distinguishes a maritally satisfied couple from a dissatisfied couple. Over the years researchers have attempted to explore this factor in a variety of ways using a variety of instruments. Recently developed interpersonal assessment instruments, such as the Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (Benjamin, 1974), have contributed empirically based instruments for the assessment of interpersonal factors. These instruments contribute a more methodologically sound approach with which to explore spouses' interpersonal perceptions within the marital relationship. Recent research has also more clearly defined the concept of intimacy as a multifactored construct which is strongly related to marital satisfaction. Waring and Reddon (1983), using the Waring Intimacy Questionnaire, have identified various components of a marital relationship which clearly contribute to marital intimacy and to marital satisfaction. The present study primarily explored the relationship between spouses' interpersonal perceptions and

marital intimacy. Results indicated, as predicted, that discrepancy in spouses' interpersonal perceptions (SASB) was inversely related to marital intimacy (WIQ). The greater the discrepancy, the lower the total intimacy scores; the less the discrepancy, the greater the total intimacy. The relationship between discrepancy in interpersonal perception, as measured by the SASB, and marital satisfaction was also explored. As expected, discrepancy in spouses' interpersonal perceptions was inversely related to marital satisfaction (DAS). Secondly, this study explored the relationship between similarity of spouses as they report themselves behaving in interpersonal situations (SASB) and marital satisfaction. For the relationship at its best, results were as predicted. Differences between spouses were inversely related to marital satisfaction.

#### Correlations between Interpersonal Perception Variables and Intimacy Factors

Post hoc correlation analyses were performed to explore the nature of the relationship between significant interpersonal perception discrepancy variables and subscales representing components of intimacy of the Waring Intimacy Questionnaire (Tables 12 and 13). Significant negative correlations were found for both husbands' and wives' interpersonal perception discrepancy scores and several intimacy factors. As discrepancy on interpersonal perception dimensions increased, both husbands and wives showed lower scores on five of the seven intimacy factors:

Table 12

Correlations between Significant Discrepancy Variables and  
Husband's Intimacy Factors

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 59

|                        | BH-CONTROL           | BW-ATTACK          | BW-CONFLICT          | WH-ATTACK           |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| TOTAL<br>INTIMACY      | -0.25077<br>0.0554   | -0.23299<br>0.0757 | -0.26291*<br>0.0442  | -0.24816<br>0.0581  |
| CONFLICT<br>RESOLUTION | -0.22524<br>0.0863   | -0.02609<br>0.8445 | -0.31059*<br>0.0167  | -0.25861*<br>0.0480 |
| AFFECTION              | -0.46985**<br>0.0002 | 0.02072<br>0.8762  | -0.28192*<br>0.0305  | 0.01993<br>0.8809   |
| COHESION               | -0.27562*<br>0.0346  | -0.04728<br>0.7222 | -0.42810**<br>0.0007 | -0.15920<br>0.2284  |
| SEXUALITY              | -0.27394*<br>0.0358  | -0.07556<br>0.5695 | -0.05818<br>0.6616   | -0.04287<br>0.7472  |
| IDENTITY               | -0.10065<br>0.4482   | -0.16186<br>0.2207 | 0.00188<br>0.9887    | -0.02012<br>0.8798  |
| COMPATIBILITY          | -0.23971<br>0.0675   | -0.21670<br>0.0992 | -0.18663<br>0.1570   | -0.22828<br>0.0820  |
| AUTONOMY               | -0.17575<br>0.1830   | -0.15957<br>0.2274 | 0.14665<br>0.2677    | -0.34272*<br>0.0079 |
| EXPRESSIVENESS         | -0.27573*<br>0.0345  | -0.16072<br>0.2240 | -0.08809<br>0.5070   | -0.30605*<br>0.0184 |
| SOCIAL<br>DESIRABILITY | -0.27021*<br>0.0385  | 0.06564<br>0.6214  | -0.16741<br>0.2050   | -0.14518<br>0.2726  |

\*p<.05

\*\*p<.01

Table 13

Correlations between Significant Discrepancy Variables and Husband's Intimacy Factors

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 59

|                | WB-ATTACK | WB-CONFLICT | WW-ATTACK  | WW-CONFLICT |
|----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| TOTAL          | -0.29453* | -0.28120*   | -0.25115   | 0.16461     |
| INTIMACY       | 0.0235    | 0.0310      | 0.0550     | 0.2128      |
| CONFLICT       | -0.27625* | -0.38514**  | -0.40545** | -0.05805    |
| RESOLUTION     | 0.0342    | 0.0026      | 0.0014     | 0.6623      |
| AFFECTION      | -0.28633* | -0.18223    | -0.18536   | 0.09720     |
|                | 0.0279    | 0.1672      | 0.1599     | 0.4639      |
| COHESION       | -0.31397* | -0.06269    | -0.05107   | 0.05777     |
|                | 0.0155    | 0.6372      | 0.7009     | 0.6639      |
| SEXUALITY      | -0.11735  | -0.25875*   | -0.05232   | 0.16692     |
|                | 0.3761    | 0.0478      | 0.6939     | 0.2064      |
| IDENTITY       | -0.06312  | -0.28847*   | -0.17004   | 0.20690     |
|                | 0.6348    | 0.0267      | 0.1979     | 0.1159      |
| COMPATIBILITY  | -0.23820  | -0.23732    | -0.03486   | 0.12463     |
|                | 0.0693    | 0.0703      | 0.7932     | 0.3470      |
| AUTONOMY       | -0.17032  | 0.11222     | -0.06365   | 0.18546     |
|                | 0.1972    | 0.3974      | 0.6320     | 0.1596      |
| EXPRESSIVENESS | -0.19191  | -0.13267    | -0.26581*  | -0.12292    |
|                | 0.1454    | 0.3165      | 0.0419     | 0.3537      |
| SOCIAL         | -0.06532  | -0.30002*   | -0.06535   | -0.05975    |
| DESIRABILITY   | 0.6231    | 0.0210      | 0.6229     | 0.653       |

\*p<.05

\*\*p<.01

Conflict Resolution, Affection, Cohesion, Sexuality, and Expressiveness. It seems plausible that these factors have an important relationship to interpersonal perception in marriage. Of the two remaining intimacy factors, one showed a significant correlation with one of the husbands' interpersonal perception discrepancy scores, and the other showed a significant correlation with one of the wives' interpersonal perception discrepancy scores. For husbands, for the relationship at worst, there was a negative correlation between a discrepancy in interpersonal perception on the Affection dimension and the intimacy factor of Autonomy. For wives, for the relationship at best, there was a negative correlation between a discrepancy in interpersonal perception on the Conflict dimension and the intimacy factor of Identity.

#### Relationship between Discrepancy in Interpersonal Perception and Marital Intimacy and Marital Satisfaction

The first hypothesis explored the congruence/discrepancy of spouses' interpersonal perceptions related to marital intimacy for the relationship at its best and at its worst. In both best and worst relationship conditions, for the wife's assessment of her marital intimacy, key interpersonal perception variables were the Attack and Conflict dimensions. In all regressions, a discrepancy on these interpersonal perception variables between how a wife (wife as actor) perceived herself treating her husband and how he perceived her treating him was important. For the husband's assessment

of his marital intimacy, discrepancies in interpersonal perception variables for both himself as actor ("I treat my wife") and for his wife as actor ("I treat my husband") were important. All three interpersonal perception variables (Attack, Control, and Conflict) were related to husband's marital intimacy. (Post hoc paired-difference t-tests were done of the husband's and wife's interpersonal perception variables which were components of the discrepancy scores that comprised the significant regression models. Results of the one significant t-test are discussed. See Appendix C for a table of mean scores for interpersonal perception variables, and a table of correlations between husbands' and wives' interpersonal perception variables.)

For the relationship at its best, it was found that husband's intimacy was inversely related to a discrepancy between the way he perceived himself treating his wife and the way she perceived him treating her on the Control dimension of the SASB, and discrepancies between the way his wife perceived herself treating him and the way he perceived her treating him on the Attack and Conflict dimensions of the SASB. A husband reports less marital intimacy the greater the discrepancy between himself and his wife in their perceptions of his controlling behavior coupled with discrepancies between himself and his wife in perception of her affectionate behaviors toward him and in the conflict or

consistency of her behavior, along the enmeshment/autonomy dimension, toward him.

For the relationship at its best, and also for the relationship at worst, it was found that wife's intimacy was inversely related to a discrepancy between how she perceived herself treating her husband and the way he perceived her treating him on the Attack and Conflict dimensions of the SASB. In both cases, a wife reported less marital intimacy the greater the discrepancy between herself and her husband in their perceptions of her affectionate behavior and the degree of conflict or consistency of her behavior (along the enmeshment/autonomy dimension) toward him. A discrepancy in perceptions of husband's controlling behavior would result from husbands and wives differentially rating husband's behavior on such SASB items as "To make sure things turn out right, I tell her what to do and how to do it." A discrepancy in perceptions of wife's affectionate behavior would result from husbands and wives differentially rating wife's behavior on such SASB items as "With wonderful love and caring, I tenderly approach him if he seems to want it." Discrepancy in perceptions of wife's conflictual or inconsistent behavior along the enmeshment/autonomy axis would result from husbands and wives differentially rating wife's behavior on such SASB items as "In a very friendly way, I help, support and instruct him," and "Without much concern, I give him the freedom to do things on his own."



Although paired-comparison t-tests revealed no significant differences between husband's and wives' mean scores on interpersonal perception variables, the discrepancy in interpersonal perception is significantly inversely related to both husband's and wife's marital intimacy and explains a significant amount of the variance of both. It is the perception of husband's controlling behavior and the perception of wife's affectionate behavior and behavioral consistency, regarding autonomy-giving or controlling behavior (irrespective of the quantitative difference) which impacts marital intimacy. These results support the research literature which indicates that it is the discrepancy or congruence of interpersonal perception between husbands and wives that is key. It suggests that in discussing marital relationships there are interpersonal perception phenomena which are crucial. This is consistent with research in the field beginning with the earliest published studies which indicated that marital relationships are best understood by exploring variables which described the relationship and spouses' perceptions of it.

Regression analyses also were performed to examine the relationship between discrepancy of interpersonal perception as measured by the SASB and marital satisfaction. For the relationship at its best, a husband reported less marital satisfaction the greater the discrepancy between how affectionately he perceived himself treating his wife and how

affectionately she perceived him treating her. For the relationship at its worst, a husband reported less marital satisfaction the greater the discrepancy between how affectionately and how controlling he perceived himself to be toward his wife and how affectionate and controlling she perceived him to be toward her.

For the relationship at its best, wife's marital satisfaction (DAS) was inversely related to a discrepancy in the way her husband perceived himself treating her and the way she perceived him treating her on the Attack and Control dimensions of the SASB and to a discrepancy between the way a wife perceived herself treating her husband and the way he perceived her treating him on the Control dimension of the SASB. A wife reported less marital satisfaction the greater the discrepancy between how affectionate and controlling her husband saw himself as treating her and how affectionate and controlling she saw him as being. Additionally, she reported less marital satisfaction the greater the discrepancy between how controlling she saw herself as being toward him and how controlling he saw her as being. For the relationship at its worst, a wife reported less marital satisfaction the greater the discrepancy between how controlling her husband perceived himself as being toward her and how controlling she perceived him being of her and the greater the discrepancy between how affectionately she perceived herself treating him and how affectionately he perceived her as treating him.

Discrepancy in interpersonal perception is key in marital satisfaction as it is in marital intimacy. The only significant difference in mean interpersonal perception scores was on the variable related to the Attack dimension for husband's treatment of the wife for the relationship at worst. This difference indicated that the husband perceived himself as being less affectionate than his wife perceived him as being.

Discrepancies between husband's and wife's perceptions of wife as actor (behaving toward her husband) and husband as being treated or behaved toward by his wife occurred in every significant model predictive of both husband's and wife's marital intimacy and marital satisfaction, in both best and worst relationship conditions. Clearly, wife's treatment of her husband is a very important interpersonal behavior dimension.

#### Relationship between Spousal Similarity and Marital Satisfaction

This second hypothesis of this study explored the similarity of reported behaviors of husbands and wives. It examined the difference between husbands' and wives' descriptions of their own behavior on the same interpersonal perception focus, e.g., "For the relationship at its best, I treat my significant other with kindness." Results indicated that differences between how they reported behaving toward their significant other (SASB) for the relationship at its best were inversely related to both husband's and wife's

marital satisfaction (DAS). Husband's marital satisfaction was inversely related to a perceived difference between himself and his wife in affectionate behavior. Wife's marital satisfaction was inversely related to perceived differences between herself and her husband in both affectionate and controlling behaviors. Benjamin (1988) reported greater similarity of response between significant others for relationships at best and more variability of response for the relationship at worst. In a nonclinic, normal population one would expect the range and type of responses to one's significant other, for the relationship at its best, would be relatively similar. One would expect that most people would behave toward their spouse in a considerate manner. One is reminded of Swensen's discussion of Bales' generalization regarding two-person groups. He posited that a two-person group cannot operate except on the assumption of love between them and is characterized by higher rates of "yea-saying" or agreement than are larger groups (Swensen, 1973). Husbands and wives experience less marital satisfaction if they perceive behavioral differences between themselves and their significant other.

#### Conclusion

This study has shown that utilizing Benjamin's Structural Analysis of Social Behavior can be valuable for its ability to identify important interpersonal dimensions in assessing marital relationships. It enables one to link

perceptual congruence of particular behavioral dimensions in relationship (e.g., affection, submission, control, consistency) to marital intimacy and to marital satisfaction. Sillers (1985) posited that very little was known about interpersonal perception within personal relationships because of a lack of a common research agenda, and he cited the diversity of approaches to such research as one of the major problems. Benjamin's Structural Analysis of Social Behavior offers a partial solution, in that it offers a theoretically based, methodologically sound approach to the study of interpersonal perceptions. There are several limitations of the present study. One is that it is limited in its generalizability. The population represented was relatively heterogeneous. Results may not be generalizable to populations of other cultural groups or to clinic populations. Additionally, it was limited in its screening for psychopathology. It is possible that individuals with DSM III-R, Axis II, Personality Disorders were not screened from the population. Further research directions might be to explore the nature of perceptual discrepancy/congruence in various clinical populations. Usefulness of this methodology in assessment of marital therapy (possibly as a pre- and postmeasure), particularly those which seek to increase communication effectiveness and intimacy, could also be explored. It would be of interest to explore further the relationship between spouses' interpersonal perception and

the factors which comprise marital intimacy. Another avenue of research could be to attempt to ascertain by means of more interactional methods [such as Gottman's (1979)] what behaviors are exchanged when a wife is the actor or the one "treating" and the husband is the one "being treated," since this appears to be a crucial dimension in perception of marital relationships.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY

This study demonstrates that discrepancies in spouse's perceptions along various interpersonal behavioral dimensions are significantly inversely related to marital intimacy and to marital satisfaction. Less marital intimacy and less marital satisfaction are related to greater discrepancy in interpersonal perception. In an attempt to correct for some confounding methodology in past research in the area interpersonal perception in marital relationships, this study utilized Benjamin's (1974) Structural Analysis of Social Behavior, an instrument designed specifically to assess interpersonal perceptual phenomena. Spouses' perception along specific behavioral dimensions were identified as being of importance in marital intimacy and in marital satisfaction. Although for the most part there were no significant differences in spouse's mean scores on interpersonal perception variables, the discrepancy of perception of husband's and wife's behavior, irrespective of the quantitative difference, impacted marital intimacy and marital satisfaction. These results supported research in the area of interpersonal perception in marital relationships which indicates that it is perceptual congruence or

discrepancy that is crucial. Results of the present study also indicated that it is discrepancy of perception regarding a wife's behavior toward her husband as significant in both husband's and wife's intimacy and satisfaction. Perception of wife's behavior was identified as an important dimension in marital relationships. Use of Benjamin's Structural Analysis of Social Behavior could contribute clearer understanding of spouse's interpersonal perception and how it relates to marital relationships. It offers a solution to one of the problems cited regarding past research in the area of interpersonal perception, that of confusing results related to a wide variety of instruments used to attempt to explore interpersonal phenomena.



APPENDIX A  
EXAMPLES OF ITEMS FROM BENJAMIN'S SASB

An example of an item which would reflect the most negative coefficient representing the vertical axis (autonomy/enmeshment) of the circumplex would be "Without much concern, x gives y the freedom to do things on her own." An item representative of the most positive coefficient representing the vertical axis (autonomy/ enmeshment) would be "To make things turn out right, x tells y exactly what to do and how to do it."

An example of an item which would reflect the most negative coefficient representing the horizontal axis of the circumplex would be "With wonderful love and caring, x tenderly approaches if y seems to want it." An item representative of the most positive coefficient representing the horizontal axis would be "Without considering what might happen, x murderously attacks y in the worst way possible." It would be important to do a more thorough diagnostic screening in future research.

APPENDIX B  
SUBSCALE OF SPOUSE OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

[illegible]

We loved each other  
We took a shower in bath together  
We warmed each other in bed  
We kicked and rough-housed together  
We held hands  
Spouse hugged or kissed me  
Spouse gave me a massage, rubbed lotion on my back, etc.  
Spouse walked close to me in bed  
Spouse scanned my cold feet  
Spouse warmed my cold feet  
Spouse greeted me affectionately when I came home  
Spouse touched me affectionately

A PLEASE is any event, originating with your partner, that you define as pleasing, or nonboiling, to you. In other words, the intent of the originator is not to question. I may have intended to be thoughtful, but it bombed. If you, the solo judge, call it a displeasure, then it is a displeasure. The same is true for all classes. The Ps and De list is an instrument of behavioral observation, not an intent meter.

- 60

APPENDIX C  
TABLES OF MEANS AND CORRELATIONS OF RAW SCORES OF SASB  
INTERPERSONAL VARIABLES

Table C-1

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Range for Raw Scores of SASB Interpersonal Variables

| Variable/Condition         | Mean    | Std Dev | Range   |         |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <u>Wife/Best:</u>          |         |         |         |         |
| ATTACK                     | -0.8409 | 0.1485  | -0.9800 | -0.1650 |
| CONTROL                    | 0.4082  | 0.3996  | -0.7850 | 0.8740  |
| CONFLICT                   | 0.0788  | 0.2896  | -0.7600 | 0.7840  |
| <u>Wife/Significant</u>    |         |         |         |         |
| <u>Other/Best:</u>         |         |         |         |         |
| ATTACK                     | -0.7977 | 0.3070  | -0.9610 | 0.7430  |
| CONTROL                    | 0.3952  | 0.3869  | -0.7270 | 0.9060  |
| CONFLICT                   | 0.0419  | 0.2896  | -0.5570 | 0.6040  |
| <u>Wife/Worst:</u>         |         |         |         |         |
| ATTACK                     | -0.4554 | 0.5397  | -0.9810 | 0.8830  |
| CONTROL                    | 0.2506  | 0.4625  | -0.8580 | 0.7640  |
| CONFLICT                   | 0.1874  | 0.3569  | -0.6580 | 0.8140  |
| <u>Wife/Significant</u>    |         |         |         |         |
| <u>Other/Worst:</u>        |         |         |         |         |
| ATTACK                     | -0.5605 | 0.4886  | -0.9600 | 0.9270  |
| CONTROL                    | 0.2103  | 0.4784  | -0.9110 | 0.8200  |
| CONFLICT                   | 0.2310  | 0.2951  | -0.5790 | 0.6760  |
| <u>Husband/Best:</u>       |         |         |         |         |
| ATTACK                     | -0.8541 | 0.1326  | -0.9890 | -0.2420 |
| CONTROL                    | 0.3843  | 0.4026  | -0.6230 | 0.9090  |
| CONFLICT                   | 0.1074  | 0.2324  | -0.3990 | 0.4650  |
| <u>Husband/Significant</u> |         |         |         |         |
| <u>Other/Best:</u>         |         |         |         |         |
| ATTACK                     | -0.8060 | 0.2864  | -0.9810 | 0.8610  |
| CONTROL                    | 0.4948  | 0.3033  | -0.4760 | 0.8650  |
| CONFLICT                   | 0.0510  | 0.2817  | -0.4910 | 0.5790  |
| <u>Husband/Worst:</u>      |         |         |         |         |
| ATTACK                     | -0.3668 | 0.5547  | -0.9410 | 0.8200  |
| CONTROL                    | 0.2085  | 0.4652  | -0.8400 | 0.7780  |
| CONFLICT                   | 0.2681  | 0.3650  | -0.6260 | 0.8310  |
| <u>Husband/Significant</u> |         |         |         |         |
| <u>Other/Worst:</u>        |         |         |         |         |
| ATTACK                     | -0.3270 | 0.6024  | -0.9440 | 0.9710  |
| CONTROL                    | 0.1934  | 0.5006  | -0.7260 | 0.9570  |
| CONFLICT                   | 0.1400  | 0.4193  | -0.7160 | 0.8950  |

Table C-2

## Correlations of Scores for Interpersonal Variables

|          | HATTK8             | HCNTL8             | HC0NB              | HSOATTK8           | HSOATTKB           | HSOANTLB           | HSOCONB             | HATTKW             | HCNTLW             | HC0NW              | HSOATTKW           | HSOANTLW           | HSOCONW |
|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------|
| HATTKB   | -0.00459<br>0.9606 | -0.39306<br>0.0001 | -0.03033<br>0.7444 | 0.15103<br>0.1026  | -0.06820<br>0.4631 | -0.37242<br>0.0001 | -0.09104<br>0.3269  | -0.11836<br>0.2018 | 0.00510<br>0.9563  | -0.03380<br>0.7163 | -0.02938<br>0.7521 | -0.31859<br>0.0004 |         |
| HCNTLB   | 0.15298<br>0.0981  | 0.39444<br>0.0001  | 0.25223<br>0.0059  | -0.01607<br>0.8629 | 0.22083<br>0.0163  | -0.05097<br>0.5836 | 0.14891<br>0.1075   | 0.04942<br>0.5951  | 0.17126<br>0.0637  | 0.07405<br>0.4255  | 0.09081<br>0.3281  | 0.03560<br>0.7019  |         |
| HC0NB    | 0.16652<br>0.0715  | 0.16090<br>0.0818  | 0.13369<br>0.1489  | 0.19824<br>0.0314  | 0.13705<br>0.1389  | 0.02060<br>0.8248  | 0.13633<br>0.1410   | -0.07954<br>0.3919 | -0.05840<br>0.5259 | 0.00295<br>0.9747  | -0.06217<br>0.5036 | 0.00375<br>0.9679  |         |
| HSOATTK8 | -0.03558<br>0.7021 | -0.19294<br>0.0363 | -0.03176<br>0.7328 | 0.22116<br>0.0161  | -0.14476<br>0.1178 | -0.33465<br>0.0002 | -0.11944<br>0.1977  | 0.08884<br>0.3387  | -0.02372<br>0.7988 | -0.01304<br>0.8885 | 0.13270<br>0.1520  | -0.17417<br>0.0593 |         |
| HSOANTLB | 0.05087<br>0.5843  | 0.57126<br>0.0001  | 0.09651<br>0.2985  | 0.00633<br>0.9458  | 0.24615<br>0.0072  | -0.06667<br>0.4732 | 0.15010<br>0.1047   | 0.12933<br>0.1628  | 0.07461<br>0.4220  | 0.07007<br>0.4509  | 0.02749<br>0.7676  | 0.18715<br>0.0424  |         |
| HSOCONB  | -0.10210<br>0.2713 | -0.03573<br>0.7009 | -0.03346<br>0.7191 | 0.09407<br>0.3109  | 0.03478<br>0.7085  | 0.02696<br>0.7720  | 0.21010<br>0.0224   | -0.16210<br>0.0795 | -0.00003<br>0.9997 | 0.20448<br>0.0263  | -0.22727<br>0.0133 | -0.04703<br>0.6130 |         |
| HATTKW   | 0.07493<br>0.4200  | 0.11453<br>0.2169  | 0.04063<br>0.6622  | -0.09287<br>0.3172 | 0.04712<br>0.6124  | 0.06042<br>0.5157  | 0.24408<br>0.0077   | -0.23385<br>0.0108 | -0.08385<br>0.3667 | 0.16359<br>0.0767  | -0.09295<br>0.3168 | -0.07303<br>0.4319 |         |
| HCNTLW   | 0.05952<br>0.5220  | 0.09051<br>0.3297  | 0.12282<br>0.1852  | 0.05823<br>0.5311  | 0.31197<br>0.0006  | -0.14557<br>0.1158 | -0.14280<br>0.11229 | 0.36438<br>0.0001  | 0.14129<br>0.1270  | -0.10791<br>0.2448 | 0.24143<br>0.0084  | -0.12857<br>0.1653 |         |
| HC0NW    | 0.20611<br>0.0251  | 0.11070<br>0.2327  | 0.03298<br>0.7229  | 0.18022<br>0.0508  | 0.04430<br>0.6338  | 0.31294<br>0.0006  | 0.10285<br>0.2677   | -0.05644<br>0.5438 | -0.05039<br>8.5879 | 0.08712<br>0.3482  | -0.11853<br>0.2011 | -0.01048<br>0.9104 |         |
| HSOATTKW | 0.10024<br>0.2801  | 0.08002<br>0.9313  | 0.01170<br>0.9000  | -0.02518<br>0.7866 | 0.01926<br>0.8360  | 0.01523<br>0.8700  | 0.37960<br>0.0001   | -0.38858<br>0.0001 | -0.27082<br>0.0030 | 0.13760<br>0.1373  | -0.00065<br>0.9944 | -0.23560<br>0.0102 |         |
| HSOANTLW | 0.04878<br>0.5999  | 0.23456<br>0.0106  | 0.13749<br>0.1376  | 0.17239<br>0.0619  | 0.13317<br>0.1505  | -0.15286<br>0.0865 | 0.45299<br>0.0984   | 0.18040<br>0.0001  | 0.18040<br>0.0506  | -0.05848<br>0.5293 | 0.14673<br>0.1128  | -0.07898<br>0.7554 |         |
| HSOCONW  | -0.03559<br>0.7020 | 0.36151<br>0.0001  | 0.05007<br>0.5902  | 0.09326<br>0.3152  | 0.25336<br>0.0053  | 0.20961<br>0.0227  | 0.02942<br>0.7518   | 0.11930<br>0.1982  | 0.18027<br>0.0508  | 0.11776<br>0.2041  | 0.09948<br>0.2838  | 0.26250<br>0.0041  |         |

## REFERENCES

- Antill, J. K., & Cotton, S. (1982). Spanier's Dyadic Adjustment Scale: Some confirmatory analyses. Australian Psychologist, 17, 181-189.
- Arias, I., & O'Leary, K. D. (1985). Semantic and perceptual discrepancies in discordant and nondiscordant marriages. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 9(1), 51-60.
- Baucom, D. H., Sayus, S., & Duke, A. (1989). Attributional style and attributional patterns among married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 596-607.
- Beck, A. T. (1988). Love is never enough. New York: Harper & Row.
- Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 4, 561-571.
- Benjamin, L. S. (1974). Structural analysis of social behavior. Psychological Review, 81, 392-425.
- Benjamin, L. S. (1984). Principles of prediction using structural analysis of social behavior. In Zucker, R. A., Aronoff, J., & Rabin, A. I. (Eds.), Personality and the prediction of behavior. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Benjamin, L. S. (1988). SASB short form user's manual. Madison: Intrex Institute.
- Bochner, A. P., Krueger, D. L., & Chmielewski, T. L. (1982). Interpersonal perceptions and marital adjustment. Journal of Communication, 32(3), 135-147.
- Bradbury, T. N., & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Attributions in marriage: Review and critique. Psychological Bulletin, 107(1), 3-33.
- Carson, R. C. (1969). Interaction concepts of personality. Chicago: Aldine.

- Chiles, J. A., Stauss, F. S., & Benjamin, L. S. (1980). Marital conflict and sexual dysfunction in alcoholic and non-alcoholic couples. British Journal of Psychiatry, 137, 266-273.
- Chronbach, L. J. (1955). Processes affecting scores on understanding of others and assumed similarity. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 177-194.
- Chelune, G. J. (1975). Self-disclosure: An elaboration of its basic dimensions. Psychological Reports, 36, 79-85.
- Chelune, G. J., Vosk, B. N., Waring, E. M., Sultan, F. E., & Ogden, J. K. (1984). Self-disclosure and its relationship to marital intimacy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40(1), 216-219.
- Davidson, B., Balswick, J., & Halverson, C. (1983). Affective self-disclosure and marital adjustment: A test of equity theory. Journal of Marriage and the Family, (Feb.), 93-102.
- Dean, D. G., & Lucas, W. L. (1978). Whose marital adjustment--Hers, his, or theirs? Psychological Reports, 43, 978.
- Dymond, R. (1954). Interpersonal perception and marital happiness. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 8, 164-171.
- Essex, M. J., Klein, M. H., Lohr, M. J., & Benjamin, L. S. (1985). Intimacy and depression in older women. Psychiatry, 48, 159-178.
- Ferguson, L. R., & Allen, D. R. (1978). Congruence of parent perception, marital satisfaction, and child adjustment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46(2), 345-346.
- Fields, N. S. (1983). Satisfaction in long-term marriages. Social Work, (Jan./Feb.), 37-41.
- Genshaft, J. L. (1980). Perceptual and defensive style variables in marital discord. Social Behavior and Personality, 8(1), 81-84.
- Gottman, J. M. (1979). Marital interaction: Experimental investigations. New York: Academic Press.
- Gottman, J. M., & Krokoff, L. J. (1989). Marital interaction and satisfaction: A longitudinal view. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57(1), 47-52.



- Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1986). Assessing the role of emotion in marriage. Behavioral Assessment, 8, 31-48.
- Gottman, J. M., Notarius, C., Gonso, J., Markman, H. (1976). A couple's guide to communication. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Hamilton, G. V. (1948). A research in marriage. New York: Lear Publications.
- Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kazak, A. E., Jarmas, A., & Snitzer, L. (1988). The assessment of marital satisfaction: An evaluation of The Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Journal of Family Psychology, 2(1), 82-91.
- Kenny, D. A. (1988). The analysis of data from two-person relationships. In S. Duck (Ed.), Handbook of personal relationships (pp. 57-77). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kotlar, S. L. (1965). Middle-class marital role perceptions and marital adjustment. Sociology and Social Research, 49, 284-291.
- Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A. R. (1966). Interpersonal perception: A theory and a method of research. New York, Springer-Verlag.
- Leary, T. (1957). Interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: Ronald Press.
- Levenson, R. W., & Gottman, J. M. (1983). Marital interaction: Physiological linkage and affective exchange. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 587-597.
- Locke, H. J. (1951). Predicting adjustment in marriage: A comparison of a divorced and a happily married group. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Luckey, E. B. (1960). Marital satisfaction and its association with congruence of perception. Marriage and Family Living, 22, 49-54.
- Newmark, C. S., Woody, G., & Ziff, D. (1977). Understanding and similarity in relation to marital satisfaction. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 83-86.
- Plechaty, M. (1987). Perceptual congruence of five attitudes among satisfied and unsatisfied couples. Psychological Reports, 61, 527-537.

- Schultz, W. A. (1960). A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Rinehart.
- Sharpley, C. F., & Cross, D. G. (1982). A psychometric evaluation of the Spanier Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 739-741.
- Sillers, A. L. (1985). Interpersonal perception in relationships. In William Ickes (Ed.), Compatible and incompatible relationships (pp. 277-305). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sillers, A. L., Pike, G. R., Jones, T. S., & Murphy, M. A. (1984). Communication and understanding in marriage. Human Communication Research, 10, 317-350.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-28.
- Spanier, G. B. (1988). Assessing the strengths of The Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Journal of Family Psychology, 2(1), 92-94.
- Swensen, C. H. (1973). Introduction to interpersonal relations. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Terman, L. M., Battenweiser, P., Ferguson, L. W., Johnson, W. B., & Wilson, D. P. (1938). Psychological factors in marital happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thompson, L. (1988). Women, men, and marital quality. Journal of Family Psychology, 2(1), 95-100.
- Tiggle, R. B., Peters, M. D., Kelly, H. H., & Vincent, J. (1982). Correlational and discrepancy indices of understanding and their relation to marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 209-215.
- Waring, E. M. (1982). Marriage and non-psychotic emotional illness. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 28(2), 111-118.
- Waring, E. M. (1988). Enhancing marital intimacy through cognitive self-disclosure. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Waring, E. M., & Chelune, G. J. (1983). Marital intimacy and self-disclosure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 39(2), 183-190.

- Waring, E. M., McElrath, D., Lefcoe, D., & Weisz, G. (1981). Dimensions of intimacy in marriage. Psychiatry, 44, 169-175.
- Waring, E. M., & Reddon, J. R. (1983). The measurement of intimacy in marriage: The Waring Intimacy Questionnaire. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 39(1), 53-57.
- Waring, E. M., Tillman, M. P., Frelick, L. Russell, L., & Weisz, G. (1980). Concepts of intimacy in the general population. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 168(8), 471-474.
- Weiss, R. L., Hops, H., & Patterson, G. R. (1973). A framework for conceptualizing marital conflict, a technique for altering it, and some data for evaluating it. In L. A. Hamerlynck, L. C. Handy, & E. J. Marsh (Eds.), Behavior change--Methodology, concepts, and practice: Proceedings of the Fourth Banff Conference on Behavior Modification. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- White, S. G., & Hatcher, C. (1984). Couple complementarity and similarity: A review of the literature. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 12(1), 15-25.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1982). Circumplex models of interpersonal behavior in clinical psychology. In P. C. Kendall & J. N. Butcher (Eds.), Handbook of research methods in clinical psychology (pp. 183-221). New York: Wiley Press.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

I was born in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1951. I began my undergraduate degree at Ohio State University in the Fall of 1969. After working full time and financing my undergraduate education myself, I received a Bachelor of Science magna cum laude from Georgia State University in 1979. I received a Master of Science from the University of Florida in 1988.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA



3 1262 08554 8068